UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/036,378	01/07/2002	Jae Ho Jung	LT-0010	5573

34610   7590   04/21/2009
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP
P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200

EXAMINER
BASEHOAR, ADAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/21/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/036,378	JUNG, JAE HO
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ADAM L. BASEHOAR	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 January 2009</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-6, 13-18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27 and 30</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-6, 13-18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27 and 30</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: The RCE filed 01/29/09.

2.   Claims 7-12, 19, 24, 28-29, 31-35, and 37 have been cancelled as necessitated by

Amendment.

3.   All previous rejections to the claims have been withdrawn as necessitated by

Amendment.

4.   Claims 1-6, 13-18, 20-21, 23, 25, 27, and 30 are pending in this case. Claims 1,

13, 18, and 25 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6.   Claims 1, 13, 18, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as

being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter

which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 13, 18, and 25 recite the limitations

"the conversion program capable of" and "the conversion program is capable of." Claim

scope is not limited by claim language that suggests or makes optional but does not

require steps to be performed, or by claim language that does not limit a claim to a

particular structure. Thus the phrases "the conversion program capable of" and "the

conversion program is capable of" render the claims indefinite because it is unclear

whether the limitation(s) following the phrases are part of the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claims 1-6 and 18, 20-21, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Flanagin et al (US-6,272,545 08/07/01) in view of Ellard (US-

5,999,937 12/07/99) in further view of Schlack et al (US-5,392,447 02/21/95) in further

view of Day (US-7,152,205 12/19/06).

      -In regard to independent claims 1 and 18, Flanagin teaches a method or

storing data in a personal information terminal, comprising:

      an input/output interface (Fig. 3) configured to receive commands from a user and

display information (column 6, lines 25-45), the input/output interface to enter data

associated with a first application program (column 6, lines 25-45)(Fig. 3) associated

with the first application program (e.g. through one of the interfaces of the "application

programs 5A-5C" on the PDA);

      composing data in a first APP (column 2, lines 63-65; column 13, lines 25-32) of

a plurality of APPs (column 2, lines 63-65; column 13, lines 25-32) embedded in the

personal information terminal (column 13, line 21: "PIM 5A")(Fig. 1), the data being in a

first format (column 11, lines 60-67; column 12, lines 1-14; column 13, lines 25-32: "A

predefined set of properties is supported for each object type");

wherein each of the plurality of application programs were selectively initiated and executed in the personal information terminal (column 2, lines 62-65; column 11, lines 57-66; column 13, lines 25-32),

wherein the first application program was a document editing program ("electronic email messages" or "communications" or "word processing") and the second APP was one of a calendar application ("appointments" or "scheduling") or "tasks" application (column 1, lines 36-38; column 11, lines 57-66; column 13, lines 25-32);

wherein contents of the first data format entered in the first application program in the PDA are stored as re-formatted data of the second data format in the second database in the PDA to match the second database to the first database while the first application program was executed (column 12, lines 19-25 & 38-40; column 11, lines 4-28: i.e. Flanagin teaches automatically updating data between two different databases when the two databases are connected as well as teaches always maintaining a connection between the two different databases).

Flanagin does not specifically teach selecting a conversion of the entered data in a format of the composed data from the first format to a second format suitable for a second application program of the plurality of APPs using a conversion program; and storing the format-converted data in a database associated with the second APP, the conversion program was initiated and executed on the PIM, the conversion program capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs into data in a format of any of any other of the plurality of application programs. Ellard teaches a data exchange system computer system including a first and second database (column 2, lines 29-33: "system transfers data between one or more input data sets…and one or more

output data sets")(Fig. 1) as well as conversion routines (Fig. 3) for converting from the

first data format of the first database (column 2, lines 29-33: "input data sets…having

different data formats") to the second different format (column 2, lines 29-33: "output

data sets...have a different data format") of the data set for data being transferred to the

second data set (column 3, lines 36-54). Ellard also teaches conversion programs capable

of converting data from any one of a plurality of data types into a format of any other

data type (column 2, lines 28-42: "configuration data to convert and transfer any type of

data into any other type of data"). Ellard further teaches wherein the conversion program

was executed on by the computer system (i.e. equivalent to PIM)(column 3, lines 37-48:

"data exchange system may be a software application being executed by a computer

system"; column 5, lines 6-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagin have been executed a conversion

program capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs

into a format of any other of the plurality of application, because Ellard teaches that by

being able to automatically convert any format to any other format a user would be

spared the significant amount of time necessary to write a custom software application to

transfer and convert data between different data sets (column 1, lines 23-26). Ellard also

taught that being able to convert data between any two formats would increase the

integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30: "integrity….entry

errors"). This process would have benefited Flanagin which had a desire that at least

some of the objects on the application data stores be either copied or transferred to other

stores in order that the user can access the same information. In this way the user of

Flanagin would have been able to access related or similar information across a plurality

of executing application programs.

Flanagin also does not teach providing an information input window for entering

format-matched data for the second APP. Ellard teaches providing an information input

window for entering format-matched data for the second APP and assigning data entered

through the information input window to a corresponding data field of the second APP

(column 7, lines 7-63: "input data gathered by reviewing data from the input

data...formats of the data records and fields determined...analyze the input data to

determine what conversions are required"; column 8, lines 26-32: e.g. "member's

birthday" date format). It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagin to have provided an information input

window for entering format-matched data for the second APP; and assigning data entered

through the information input window to a corresponding data field of the second APP,

because Ellard taught that being able to convert data between any two formats would

increase the integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30:

"integrity....entry errors").

Neither Flanagin nor Ellard teach wherein the different application programs had

specific input screens inputting user data and wherein the input window was displayed in

the input screen together with the composed data. Schlack et al taught a user interface

screen for entering data for a plurality of different application programs on a PDA (Figs.

6-17), wherein the user interface screen included simultaneously displaying an input

window for entering data for the second application program (column 9, lines 45-67;

column 10, lines 1-66: "operator can then transfer the identified text data within selected

boxes...to fill a template field that is overlayed on the display...select a box for each of the fields")(Figs. 14-17) . It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the user interface of Flanagin to have provided separate display screens for entering data for the respective application programs and for displaying input windows within said screens as shown in Schlack et al, because Schlack et al taught that by entering data into an application program via an in input window with an accompanying conversion screen on a PDA said entered data could be converted and mapped to other application programs on the PDA thereby decreasing the number of key strokes required and the probability that a data entry error will occur (column 1, lines 55-66; column 2, lines 45-53; column 8, lines 55-63; column 9, lines 45-62).

Neither of the cited references specifically teaches wherein the conversion selecting was performed by selecting one of a plurality of menus displayed on the input screen. Day teaches an input screen comprising a menu for selecting one of a plurality of conversions for converting a selected input data format into a selected output data format via said selected conversion (column 9, lines 59-67; column 10, lines 1-21: "activation of an icon...menu generated...user to specify...an existing control information...to be sued for transformation")(Fig. 9), wherein the selected conversion required mapping input fields of the first input data format to output fields of the second output data format (column 4, lines 25-51)(Fig. 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the modified system of Flanagin to have incorporated a menu for selecting data conversion, because Day taught that through an interface menu allowing a user to select the appropriate data transformation information,

the user could more easily select/transform the input data into any desired format

(column 10, lines 1-21: "desired output format").

   -In regard to dependent claims 2-3, and 20, Flanagin teaches wherein the data

format (column 13, lines 25-32: "each object type") of each APP program (column 13,

lines 25-32: "appointments", "tasks", email, etc.) was different from a data format of the

other APPs (column 13, lines 25-32: "predefined set of properties is supported for each

object type" and "distinct") and wherein each APP had an associated database to store

data composed in the corresponding APP (column 13, lines 25-32: "distinct database").

Flanagin also teaches wherein database fields where utilized to store data (column 12,

line 3: "plurality of fields"). Flanagin does not specifically teach utilizing a delimiter

between portions of data in the data block to indicate a new field. The Examiner notes

that it was notoriously well known in the database art at the time of the invention for

delimiters (i.e. characters or strings of data) to be used in databases, for the benefit of

separating, or marking the start and end of items of data in a record (Note: Ellard

Reference).

   -In regard to dependent claims 4, and 23, Flanagin teaches wherein the PIM

had a plurality of application programs (column 13, lines 25-32) wherein the first APP

was a document editing program ("electronic email messages") and the second APP was

one of a calendar application ("appointments") or "tasks" application, and wherein the

first and second databases are matched without data entry into the second application

program (Flanagin: column 12, lines 22-25 & 38-40; column 11, lines 4-28: i.e. via the synchronization manager)(Ellard: column 7, lines 7-31)(Fig. 4).

     -In regard to dependent claim 5, Flanagin teaches composing data in the first APP (column 13, lines 25-32).

     Flanagin does not teach selecting a second APP in which to store the composed data. Ellard teaches selecting a second APP in which to store the composed data (column 2, lines 27-65)(Figs 2 &4). It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagin to have allowed the data in a first APP to be converted and stored as data in a selected second APP, because Ellard taught that being able to convert data between any two formats would increase the integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30: "integrity....entry errors").

     -In regard to dependent claims 6 and 21, Flanagin does not teach providing an information input window for entering format-matched data for the second APP; and assigning data entered through the information input window to a corresponding data field of the second APP, wherein the input window includes sub-windows. Ellard teaches providing an information input window for entering format-matched data for the second APP and assigning data entered through the information input window to a corresponding data field of the second APP (column 7, lines 7-63: "input data gathered by reviewing data from the input data...formats of the data records and fields determined...analyze the input data to determine what conversions are required"; column 8, lines 26-32: e.g. "member's birthday" date format). It would have been obvious to one

or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagin to have

provided an information input window for entering format-matched data for the second

APP; and assigning data entered through the information input window to a

corresponding data field of the second APP, because Ellard taught that being able to

convert data between any two formats would increase the integrity of the data by

minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30: "integrity....entry errors").

9.   Claims 13-17, 25, 27, and 30, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Flanagin et al (US-6,272,545 08/07/01) in view of Crozier (US-

5,392,390 02/21/95) of Ellard (US-5,999,937 12/07/99) in further view of Schlack et al

(US-5,392,447 02/21/95).

       -In regard to independent claim 13, Flanagin teaches composing data in a first

one of a plurality of application programs (column 13, lines 25-32), wherein each of the

plurality of application programs was selectively operated in the personal information

terminal (column 2, lines 62-65; column 11, lines 57-66; column 13, lines 25-32).

       Flanagin further teaches wherein operating the first application program using a

first procedure to enter data in the first application program (column 11, lines 57-66;

column 13, lines 25-32) and operating the first application program using a second

procedure to enter data in the first application and the second application program

database (column 12, lines 19-25 & 38-40; column 11, lines 4-28).

       Flanagin does not teach entering a prescribed identifier code being indicative of a

second one of the plurality of application programs into which the composed data is to be

stored; selecting the second APP based on the ID code using a table to match prescribed

ID codes; converting a first format to a second format; and storing the data in a database

associated with the second APP. Crozier teaches having a prescribed identifier code

being indicative of a second one of the plurality of application programs into which the

composed data is to be stored (column 3, lines 56-66; column 5, lines 43-49; column 8,

lines 40-56: "DT Application specifies the...application name"); selecting the second

APP based on the ID code using a table to match prescribed ID codes (column 3, lines

56-66; column 5, lines 43-49; column 8, lines 40-56); converting a first format to a

second format (column 3, lines 9-32; column 3, lines 56-66); and storing the data in a

database associated with the second APP (column 3, lines 9-32; column 3, lines 56-66).

It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

for the PIM of Flanagin to have allowed the data in a first APP to be converted and stored

as data in a second APP, because Crozier teaches that doing so would allow translating

data between a wide variety of applications while ensuring that the data need only be

entered once (column 3, lines 27-30).

Flanagan also does not teach wherein the conversion program was initiated and

executed on the personal information terminal, the conversion program capable of

converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs into a format of any

other of the plurality of applications. Ellard teaches a data exchange system computer

system including a first and second database as well as conversion routines for converting

from the first data format of the database to the second different format of the data set for

data being transferred to the second data set (column 3, lines 36-54). Ellard also teaches

conversion programs capable of converting data from any one of a plurality of data types

into a format of any other data type (column 2, lines 28-42: "configuration data to convert

and transfer any type of data into any other type of data"). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagin have

been capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs

into a format of any other of the plurality of application, because Ellard teaches that by

being able to automatically convert any format to any other format a user would be

spared the significant amount of time necessary to write a custom software application to

transfer and convert data between different data sets (column 1, lines 23-26). Ellard also

taught that being able to convert data between any two formats would increase the

integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30: "integrity….entry

errors").

The modified Flanagin does not specifically teach wherein data indicating the

prescribed identifier code was manually entered and detecting whether or not the

prescribed identifier code was present. Schlack teaches manually entering a prescribed

identifier code in an application program for helping convert the various fields of the

entered data to linking fields of a plurality of other application programs in a PDA,

whereby the identifier code was detected by the PDA (column 9, lines 46-67: "linking

fields…file tag information...annotations"; column 10, lines 1-21)(Figs. 14-15). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the

user interface of Flanagin to have provided a manual entry and detection of a user

assigned identifier code as shown in Schlack et al, because Schlack et al taught that by

entering data into an application program via an in input window with an accompanying

conversion screen on a PDA said entered data could be converted and mapped to other

application programs on the PDA thereby decreasing the number of key strokes required

and the probability that a data entry error will occur (column 1, lines 55-66; column 2,

lines 45-53; column 8, lines 55-63; column 9, lines 45-62).

   -In regard to dependent claim 14, Crozier teaches wherein the prescribed

identifier code specifies a data section including a part of the composed data (column 8,

lines 40-65: "HH Field Name"), and wherein converting the format of the composted data

converts the data in the specified data section to the second format (column 3, 9-15:

"mapping and translating the data to the formats expected by a second computer

application"). It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention for the PIM of Flanagin to have allowed the data in a first APP to be

converted and stored as data in a second APP, because Crozier teaches that doing so

would allow translating data between a wide variety of applications while ensuring that

the data need only be entered once (column 3, lines 27-30).

   -In regard to dependent claims 15-16, Flanagin teaches wherein the data format

(column 13, lines 25-32: "each object type") of each APP program (column 13, lines 25-

32: "appointments", "tasks", email, etc.) was different from a data format of the other

APPs (column 13, lines 25-32: "predefined set of properties is supported for each object

type" and "distinct") and wherein each APP had an associated database to store data

composed in the corresponding APP (column 13, lines 25-32: "distinct database").

Flanagin also teaches wherein database fields where utilized to store data (column 12,

line 3: "plurality of fields"). Flanagin does not specifically teach utilizing a delimiter

between portions of data in the data block to indicate a new field. The Examiner notes

that it was notoriously well known in the database art at the time of the invention for

delimiters (i.e. characters or strings of data) to be used in databases, for the benefit of

separating, or marking the start and end of items of data in a record (Note: Ellard

Reference).

 -In regard to dependent claim 17, Flanagin teaches wherein the PIM had a

plurality of application programs (column 13, lines 25-32) wherein the first APP was a

document editing program ("electronic email messages") and the second APP was one of

a calendar application ("appointments") or "tasks" application, and wherein the first and

second databases are matched without data entry into the second application program

(Flanagin: column 12, lines 22-25 & 38-40; column 11, lines 4-28: i.e. via the

synchronization manager)(Ellard: column 7, lines 7-31)(Fig. 4).

 -In regard to independent claim 25, Flanagin teaches a method or storing data

in a PDA, comprising:

 an input/output interface (Fig. 3) configured to receive commands and display

information (column 6, lines 25-45), the input output interface to enter data associated

with a first application program based on input of a user (column 6, lines 25-45)(Fig. 3);

 a central processing unit configured to receive and process commands entered

into the PDA (column 6, lines 25-45: "PDA");

 a memory of the PDA configured to accommodate a plurality of databases

(column 13, lines 25-32: "different databases") associated with a plurality of application

programs (column 13, lines 25-32: "appointments", "tasks", etc), the plurality of

databases provided in the PDA (column 13, lines 21-39)(Fig. 1: 5A-5C) wherein a first

APP stored on the PIM is configured to receive and store data in a first database using a

first format and a second APP on the PDA configured to receive an store data in a second

database using a second format (column 13, lines 25-32: "A predefined set of properties

is supported for each object type").

Flanagin also teaches wherein contents of the first data format entered in the first

application program in the PDA are stored as re-formatted data of the second data format

in the second database in a PDA to match the second database to the first database while

the first application program was executed (column 12, lines 22-25 & 38-40; column 11,

lines 4-28: i.e. Flanagin teaches automatically updating data between two different

databases when the two databases are connected as well as teaches always maintaining a

connection between the two different databases).

Flanagan does not teach a conversion program to receive data in a first format,

reformat the received data to the second format, and store the reformatted data in a

second database. Flanagan also does not teach wherein the first application program, the

conversion program conversion program was initiated and executed on the personal

information terminal, the conversion program capable of converting data from any one of

the plurality of application programs into a format of any other of the plurality of

application. Ellard teaches a data exchange system computer system including a first and

second database as well as conversion routines for converting from the first data format

of the database to the second different format of the data set for data being transferred to

the second data set (column 3, lines 36-54). Ellard also teaches conversion programs

capable of converting data from any one of a plurality of data types into a format of any

other data type (column 2, lines 28-42: "configuration data to convert and transfer any type of data into any other type of data"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagin have been capable of converting data from any one of the plurality of application programs into a format of any other of the plurality of application, because Ellard teaches that by being able to automatically convert any format to any other format a user would be spared the significant amount of time necessary to write a custom software application to transfer and convert data between different data sets (column 1, lines 23-26). Ellard also taught that being able to convert data between any two formats would increase the integrity of the data by minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30: "integrity….entry errors").

Flanagin does not teach having a prescribed identifier marker being indicative of a second one of the plurality of application programs into which the composed data is to be stored; selecting the second APP based on the ID code using a table to match prescribed ID codes; converting a first format to a second format; and storing the data in a database associated with the second APP. Crozier teaches having a prescribed identifier code being indicative of a second one of the plurality of application programs into which the composed data is to be stored (column 3, lines 56-66; column 5, lines 43-49; column 8, lines 40-56: "DT Application specifies the…application name"); selecting the second APP based on the ID code using a table to match prescribed ID codes (column 3, lines 56-66; column 5, lines 43-49; column 8, lines 40-56); converting a first format to a second format (column 3, lines 9-32; column 3, lines 56-66); and storing the data in a database associated with the second APP (column 3, lines 9-32; column 3, lines 56-66). It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

for the PIM of Flanagin to have allowed the data in a first APP to be converted and stored

as data in a second APP, because Crozier teaches that doing so would allow translating

data between a wide variety of applications while ensuring that the data need only be

entered once (column 3, lines 27-30).

The modified Flanagin does not specifically teach wherein the different

application programs had specific input screens whereby the conversion program

generated an information input window in a first screen for mapping the data to

prescribed fields of the second program. Schlack et al taught a user interface screen for

entering data for a plurality of different application programs on a PDA (Figs. 6-17),

wherein the user interface screen included simultaneously displaying an input window

based on the appropriate conversion for entering data for the second application program

(column 9, lines 45-67; column 10, lines 1-66: "operator can then transfer the identified

text data within selected boxes...to fill a template field that is overlayed on the

display...select a box for each of the fields")(Figs. 14-17) . It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the user interface of

Flanagin to have provided separate display screens for entering data for the respective

application programs and for displaying input windows within said screens as shown in

Schlack et al, because Schlack et al taught that by entering data into an application

program via an in input window with an accompanying conversion screen on a PDA said

entered data could be converted and mapped to other application programs on the PDA

thereby decreasing the number of key strokes required and the probability that a data

entry error will occur (column 1, lines 55-66; column 2, lines 45-53; column 8, lines 55-

63; column 9, lines 45-62).

-**In regard to dependent claim 27,** Flanagin teaches wherein the PIM had a

plurality of application programs (column 13, lines 25-32) wherein the first APP was a

document editing program ("electronic email messages") and the second APP was one of

a calendar application ("appointments") or "tasks" application, and wherein the first and

second databases are matched without data entry into the second application program

(Flanagin: column 12, lines 22-25 & 38-40; column 11, lines 4-28: i.e. via the

synchronization manager)(Ellard: column 7, lines 7-31)(Fig. 4).

-**In regard to dependent claim 30,** Flanagin does not teach providing an

information input window for entering format-matched data for the second APP; and

assigning data entered through the information input window to a corresponding data

field of the second APP, wherein the input window includes sub-windows. Ellard

teaches providing an information input window for entering format-matched data for the

second APP and assigning data entered through the information input window to a

corresponding data field of the second APP (column 7, lines 7-63: "input data gathered

by reviewing data from the input data...formats of the data records and fields

determined...analyze the input data to determine what conversions are required"; column

8, lines 26-32: e.g. "member's birthday" date format). It would have been obvious to one

or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the PIM of Flanagin to have

provided an information input window for entering format-matched data for the second

APP; and assigning data entered through the information input window to a

corresponding data field of the second APP, because Ellard taught that being able to

convert data between any two formats would increase the integrity of the data by

minimizing entry errors (column 1, lines 26-30: "integrity....entry errors").

Response to Arguments

10.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 13, 18, and 25 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

11.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

        Please note the additionally cited references on the accompanying PTO-892

Form.

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Adam L. Basehoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-

4121. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Adam L Basehoar/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178